

Specifically, in the currently outstanding non-final Official Action, the Examiner has:

1. Identified the following inventions that are alleged to be patentably distinct from one another:

Invention A – Claims 1-8, 39, 45 and 51, drawn to a group robot system where detection of an object by a sensing robot results in the movement of other, non-detecting robots to outside an area of search, classified in Class 700, subclass 251;

Invention B – Claims 9-16, 40, 46, and 52, drawn to a group robot system where detection of an object by a sensing robot results in the movement of other, non-detecting robots to an initial position, classified in Class 700, subclass 247

Invention C – Claims 17-56 (presumably meaning Claims 17-38, 41-44, 47-50 and 53-56, see above), drawn to a group robot system that uses various hierarchical communication methods, classified in Class 700, subclass 249.

**Note: Applicant believes that the Examiner intended to designate Claims 17-38, 41-44, 47-50 and 53-56 as the claims drawn to the Invention C. Applicant's basis for this belief is that otherwise, Invention C would include claims that the Examiner has indicated to be directed to Invention A or Invention B. In this regard, Applicant respectfully calls attention to items 2-5 of the currently outstanding Official Action that clearly indicate that the Examiner deemed Inventions A-C to be distinct from one another as not overlapping with one another, not being obvious variants of one another and being separately usable.**

2. Required the Applicants to elect one of the foregoing inventions under 35 USC 121 for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted.
3. Required Applicant to list all of the pending claims that are deemed to be readable on the elected invention.

4. Required Applicant also to elect among the following species:

Species I – Claim 27-30, 42, 48 and 54 whose subject matter is a group robot system with varying resolutions of sensing on the robots

Species II – Claims 31-34, 43, 49 and 55 whose subject matter is a group robot system with different types of sensors on the robots.

Species III – Claims 35-38, 44, 50 and 56 whose subject matter is a group robot system with different methods of processing sensor information on the robots.

**Note: All of the claims directed to the species specified by the Examiner are contained among the claims the Examiner has specified as being directed to the Invention C, but are not among the claims specified by the Examiner as being directed to either Invention A or Invention B. Accordingly, Applicant has assumed that the Examiner's species election requirement is directed only to the Invention C, and further that no election of species is required in response to the currently outstanding Official Action in the event that the Invention C is not elected for further prosecution on the merits herein.**

5. Failed to acknowledge Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 USC 119 (a)-(d) and (f), and confirm the receipt of the required copies of the priority documents by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. – **Acknowledgement of Applicant's claim for foreign priority and confirmation of the receipt by the United States Patent and Trademark Office of the required copies of the priority document is respectfully requested in response to this communication.**

6. Indicated that the formal drawings filed with this application on 17 December 2003 have been accepted.
7. Failed to comment upon the Information Disclosure Statements filed in this Application –  
**Applicant respectfully requests confirmation of the consideration of the art called to the attention of the United States Patent and Trademark Office in response to this communication.**

No further comment regarding items 5-7 above is deemed to be required in these Remarks.

In response to the currently outstanding requirement for restriction (see items 1-4 above), **Applicant hereby elects Invention A: Claims 1-8, 39, 45 and 51, without traverse** for further prosecution in the merits in this application.

**For the reasons set forth hereinabove, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's requirement for an election of species in addition to the foregoing election among Inventions A-C is not required in this response because the claims specified by the Examiner as constituting the various species do not include the claims directed to the elected Invention A.**

Early further substantive consideration and allowance of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned representative also respectfully notes that despite the Examiner's indication that a telephone call was made to him on 28 June 2007, Applicant's undersigned representative he does not recall the receipt of a telephone call and/or any message from the Examiner concerning this application. Consequently, it is assumed that Applicant's undersigned representative was either out of his office or otherwise unavailable at the time of the Examiner's call.

Applicant believes that additional fees beyond those submitted herewith are not required in connection with the consideration of this response to the currently outstanding Official Action. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. **04-1105**, as necessary, for the correct payment of all fees which may be due in connection with the filing and consideration of this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 1, 2007

  
SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Reg. No.: 27,840

David A. Tucker  
(Type or print name of practitioner)  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Tel. No. (617) 517-5508

Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP  
P.O. Box 55874  
P.O. Address

Customer No.: 21874

Boston, MA 02205

622577